



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/201,749 | 12/01/1998 | PING-WEN ONG | 11 | 1977 |

7590 08/14/2003

Ryan, Mason & Lewis
1300 Post Rd.
Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3624

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/201,749

Applicant(s)

ONG, PING-WEN

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 21.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in this communication filed 06/02/03 entered as Response, paper no. 22.
2. The IDS submitted 06/02/03 has been reviewed and entered as paper no.21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrassia, Jr. et al (US 5,941,957), hereafter Ingrassia in view of (US 6,125,371) Bohannon et al, hereafter Bohannon.

With respect to claim 1, Ingrassia teaches, receiving a request for the electronic document, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document (col. 7, lines 30-38 and lines 57-65) and identifying as a function of the creation time-stamp and the requested timestamp a machine storing a version of the electronic document having a creation time corresponding to the requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22). Ingrassia did not teach, transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine.

Bohannon discloses transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine (col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-

Art Unit: 3624

18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine and in view of Ingrassia's teachings of the web browser sending requests via a network and the WTS server creating a session for the browser based on a unique ID and issuing a timestamp and storing the URL and timestamp of a web page in col. 7, lines 30-65 and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to know the time the electronic document was transmitted from the server and stored in a URL history list and a command list created for the session.

With respect to claim 2, Ingrassia teaches, an address identifying the document includes the creation time-stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to claim 3, Ingrassia teaches, the address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-22 and fig. 6).

With respect to claim 4, Ingrassia the Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said requested time stamp (col. 9, lines 5-26).

With respect to claim 5, Ingrassia did not teach, transmitting the version of said electronic document with the most recent creation time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the version of the electronic document with the most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of the electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp in view of Ingrassia's

Art Unit: 3624

teachings of ("Before loading web page 224, the following events occur : (a) browser 114A instructs Master Applet 124A to stop routine, (b) via socket connection established for browser 114A and web page 214A, Master Applet 124A sends a command to inform WTS server 144 that web page 214 has been unloaded, and disconnects the socket connection established for browser 114A and web ...".) in col. 8, line 61-67 and col. 9, line 1-27 because such a modification in Ingrassia would allow Ingrassia's system to know when the time-stamp was issued, received, and the URL stored into the session (a session is defined as a collection of web page interactions that occur over a given period of time).

With respect to claim 6, Ingrassia teaches, the request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 11-15 and lines 30-65).

With respect to claim 7, Ingrassia teaches, the requested time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 57-65).

With respect to claim 8, Ingrassia teaches, a memory (col. 4, line 51, col. 7, lines 45-49 and col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58) and a processor (col. 4, line 48-51).

Independent claim 8 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 9 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 9.

With respect to claim 10 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect claim 11 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 12 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 13 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 14 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 15, Ingrassia teaches, a computer readable medium having computer readable program code means, the computer readable program code means comprising program code means (col. 4, line 52 and col. 7, lines 19-29);

This independent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 16, Ingrassia teaches, receiving a request for the electronic document associated with the domain name, the electronic document having multiple versions, each of the versions being identified by a creation time-stamp indicating a creation time of the corresponding version, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document in col. 7, lines 30-65; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp and the requested time-stamp, a machine corresponding to a version of the domain name for a time period corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 9-22) and transmitting an indication of the identified machine storing the electronic document corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 22-44). Ingrassia did not teach, a "domain name", but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a

Art Unit: 3624

domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 17 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 18 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3

With respect claim 19 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 20 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 21 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 22, Ingrassia teaches, a memory (col. 4, line 51-52) for storing a database identifying a machine storing an electronic document (col. 4, lines 44-48) corresponding to said domain name for a plurality of time periods (col. 8, lines 28-30 and lines 56-58, and col. 16, lines 22-52); a processor (col. 4, line 48-51) operatively coupled to said memory (col. 4, line 51-52) configured to receive a request for an electronic document associated with the domain name (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52), said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a creation time-stamp indicating a creation time of the

Art Unit: 3624

corresponding version, the request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document (col. 7, lines 49-62); access the database as a function of said creation time-stamp and the requested time-stamp to identify a machine corresponding to a version of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said requested time-stamp (col. 7, lines 16-18 and col. 8, lines 34-44); and transmit an indication of the identified machine storing electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp (col. 8, lines 11-19). Ingrassia did not teach, a "domain name", but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate an electronic document with a domain name and to modify in Ingrassia because such a modification would allow Ingrassia's system to have an address of a network connection that would identify the owner of the address in a hierarchical format which is well known in the art of the Internet.

With respect to claim 23 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 24 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

With respect to claim 25 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

With respect to claim 26 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 27 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 28 this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 15.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 06/02/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicant argues: Applicant notes that Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest "receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp including a creation time of a desired version of a multiple version document" as required by each of the independent claims of the present invention has been considered but is not persuasive based on the claim language does not disclose or suggest to the Examiner the "identifying as a function of the timestamp, a machine storing a version of said electronic document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp. Independent claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 recite "a method ... comprising the steps of: receiving a request for said electronic document, said request including a requested time-stamp ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp a machine storing a version of said electronic document having a creation time corresponding to said requested time-stamp; and transmitting said electronic document ... from said identified machine" in claim 1. Claim 8 recites "a system for storing an electronic document having multiple versions, ..., said system comprising: a memory for storing said multiple versions of said electronic document ...;

Art Unit: 3624

and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to: receive a request for said electronic document, said request including a requested time-stamp indicating a time ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp ...; and transmit said electronic document ... said requested time-stamp from said identified machine.” Claim 15 recites “an article of manufacture ..., said article of manufacture comprising: a computer readable medium having a computer readable program code means embodied thereon, ... causing a computer to: receive a request for said electronic document, ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp a machine storing a version ...; and transmit said electronic document ... from said identified machine.” Claim 16 recites “a method for resolving a domain name, said method comprising the steps of: receiving a request for an electronic document ...; identifying as a function of said creation time-stamp ...; and transmitting an indication of said identified machine storing ...”. Claim 22 recites “a system for resolving a domain name, said system comprising: “a memory for storing a database identifying machine ...; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, ... to: receive a request for an electronic document associated with said domain name, ...; access said database as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp to identify ...; and transmit an indication of said identified machine ...”. Claim 28 recites “an article of manufacture for resolving a domain name, ... comprising: a computer readable medium having computer readable program code ..., ... to: receive a request for an electronic document associated with said domain name, ...;

Art Unit: 3624

identify as a function of said creation time-stamp and said requested time-stamp a machine ...; and transmit an indication of said identified machine ...”.

2. Applicant argues: Bohannon et al does not suggest that such time stamps are even provided or known to the user and there certainly is no suggestion that such time stamps are employed in a user request for a data record to identify a particular version has been considered but is not persuasive because the Examiner does not find in the claim limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 that the time stamps are employed in a user request for a data record to identify a particular version.

3. Applicant argues: Thus, Ingrassia and Bohannon, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp indicating a creation time of a desired version of a multiple-version document and require transmitting an indication of said identified machine corresponding to the requested time-stamp, as required by independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 28 has been considered but is not persuasive because it is interpreted that Ingrassia and Bohannon teach receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp indicating a creation time of a desired version of a multiple-version document and require transmitting an indication of said identified machine corresponding to the requested time-stamp, as required by independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 28. Ingrassia teaches, receiving the request for an electronic document including a time-stamp indicating a time associated with a desired version of the electronic document and identifying as a function of the creation of a time-stamp and the requested timestamp a machine storing a version of the electronic document having

Art Unit: 3624

a creation time corresponding to the requested time-stamp in col. 7, lines 30-38 and lines 57-65 and col. 8, lines 9-22. Bohannon discloses, transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine in col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-18.

The Examiner carefully drew up a correspondence of each of Applicant's claimed limitations, one or more referenced passages in Ingrassia, what is well known in the art and what is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The Examiner is entitled to give limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).<

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3624


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Inquiries

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Unofficial communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.


E. Colbert
August 11, 2003


DR. GEOFFREY R. AKERS, P.E.
PRIMARY EXAMINER